

change very much in the broader sense but that we address with respect to additional rules because it disconnects the income from the source of production from the consumers who are going to be consuming the benefits, or the fruits of production.

The engine of progress in this country, in my judgment, is how do we create new, good-paying jobs? When people sit at the dinner table at night and talk about their lives as a family, the only question that matters is, "Are we increasing our standard of living?" And, regrettably for 60 percent of the American families, the answer is, "No. We are working harder." And over the last 20 years we are making less money, if you adjust it for inflation. There is no Government program, none that is as effective as a good job, or a substitute for a good job, that pays well.

Now, the question is, Why are we losing manufacturing jobs? Why are jobs moving out of our country? Why are jobs going overseas? And what can we do about it?

First, fair trade and fair competition. Our country ought not be ashamed ever to stand up and say we demand fair trade. We expect to compete, but we demand the competition be fair as well. When I was a kid walking to school, I knew every day that our country could win just by waking up; we were the biggest, the strongest, the best, and we could win the economic contest with one hand tied behind our back. But times are different, and we cannot do that today. And we ought to insist that fair competition and fair trade be hallmarks of our economic circumstances in this country.

Second, it seems to me we ought to change our Tax Code. I introduced some legislation, and I am introducing more that says let us stop subsidizing movement of jobs overseas, this insidious, perverse provision in our Tax Code that says, if you close your plant here and move your jobs to a tax haven overseas, we will give you a little bonus. We will give you a tax break. We have already voted on that on the floor of the Senate, and I was unable to pass closing the tax break that says we will reward you if you move your jobs overseas. But guess what. You are going to get a chance on a dozen more occasions this year to vote on the same thing. We ought to shut down the tax breaks in our Tax Code that say to people: Move the jobs overseas and we will reward you.

Third, we ought to provide some basic incentive to create jobs here, and I propose a 20 percent payroll tax credit for those who create new net jobs in this country. Let us shut off the incentive to move jobs overseas and create incentives to create new jobs in this country.

I am not much interested in how many jobs exist in Japan or how many jobs exist in Germany or how many jobs exist in Mexico. I am interested in how many jobs exist in our country.

This is an economic competition in which we are involved. It is a competition with winners and losers. It is not a circumstance where everybody wins. It is a circumstance where, if the rules are unfair and the competition is not fair, there are winners and losers. We are losing our manufacturing base in this country, and we can do something about it, the quicker the better. The task force that was headed by JEFF BINGAMAN from New Mexico is a task force that makes serious and specific recommendations that will try to create the incentives to create new jobs in this country—not elsewhere; in this country—in the future. The currency of ideas that are represented by the recommendations of that task force will be a set of ideas we will discuss over and over again in this Congress in 1996.

It will not surprise anyone to understand the anxiety that exists in our country today. People are worried. They know that they are less secure in their jobs. You can work 20 years and be laid off without a blink by some enterprises. Their jobs pay less adjusted for inflation than they did 20 years ago in many cases. So they are worried about fewer jobs, jobs that pay less, and jobs with less security, and they want something done about it that increases the standard of living in this country.

Government cannot wave a wand to make that happen, but the rules and the debate about how you create good jobs and how you stop the hemorrhaging of jobs from our country moving overseas is a debate that we ought to have right here in the center of the Senate.

We are going to have an Olympics in Atlanta in August, and everybody is going to be rooting. We will root for all the wonderful athletes all around the world, but especially we will decide as Americans that those men and women wearing the red, white and blue are our team and we want them to do well. There is another competition that is not on the field of athletics. It is in the field of economics, worldwide economic competition to decide who wins and advances with new jobs and better opportunity and who suffers the turn-of-the-century British disease of long economic decline, who wins and who loses.

Frankly, I want us to have a plan. I want our team to win. I want our team to decide that we will compete and we will win, and we will make sure the rules are fair as we compete. That is the purpose of trying to put together a series of steps that say our intent is to try to encourage new jobs created in this country and try to discourage, through the insidious provisions in our Tax Code, the export or the shipment of good jobs in America overseas. We ought not pay for that. We ought not provide incentives to move jobs elsewhere. I tell you what. Anybody who thinks that makes sense is not thinking. And I hope we will get the Senate to think a lot about that in 1996.

Mr. President, we will be discussing at some greater length the legislation

that I have introduced, and we will discuss at greater length the recommendations of the high wage task force of Senator BINGAMAN in the future as well. I look forward to those discussions.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. SPECTER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DEWINE). The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, on behalf of the majority leader, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment for 1 minute and that, immediately following the reconvening of the Senate, time for the two leaders be reserved, the Journal of proceedings be deemed approved to date, no resolutions come over under the rule, the call of the calendar be dispensed with, the morning hour be deemed to have expired, and that I be recognized as if in morning business.

There being no objection, at 1:06 p.m., the Senate adjourned until 1:07 p.m. the same day.

The Senate met at 1:07 p.m., and was called to order by the Honorable MIKE DEWINE, a Senator from the State of Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry. For the benefit of those in the gallery and whoever may be watching on C-SPAN 2 and for me, too, we now have a new legislative day.

Would the Chair, without reference to the Parliamentarian, explain the procedural purpose?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To qualify resolutions to go to committees.

Mr. SPECTER. I thank the Chair and the Parliamentarian, Mr. Dove.

LEGAL AND ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I have sought recognition to comment about the immigration bill which is scheduled to come before the Judiciary Committee tomorrow and, first of all, an amendment which will be offered by a number of Senators, including the distinguished Presiding Officer, Senator DEWINE of Ohio, under the leadership of Senator SPENCER ABRAHAM of Michigan, to divide the appropriations bill into two parts, that relating to legal immigration and that relating to illegal immigration.

I think it is important to do so, that the bills have independent status and that there not be an effort made to tie either bill to the other. The bill on legal immigration has no more to do with the bill on illegal immigration than, say, the telecommunications bill has to do with the crime bill. Illegal immigration is a major problem in America.

I picked the telecommunications bill not at random but because the distinguished chairman of the Commerce Committee walked in for a moment.

The bill on illegal immigration is a very important bill. We ought to protect our borders. We ought to take it up, in my view, separately. On the bill on legal immigration, I have already stated my intention to introduce an amendment, but I think it worthwhile to make this statement in the Chamber of the Senate so it will appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and my colleagues and others will have notice as to what I intend to do.

But the amendment would make the following changes. First it would increase the worldwide level of employment-based visas from 90,000 to 135,000 a year. Second, it would eliminate the fee that employers must pay for each immigrant employee they sponsor, which is now \$10,000 or 10 percent of the employee's compensation annually, whichever is greater. Third, my amendment would eliminate the fee that certain employers must pay for each temporary foreign worker that they employ.

Next, it restores the maximum length of the H visa to 6 years and the maximum length of the L visa to 7 years. Next, it restores the "Outstanding Researchers and Professors," which is a category that is exempt from the labor market screening requirement. It also eliminates the requirement that employers must pay foreign workers 105 percent of prevailing wages.

Mr. President, there has been an effort made to limit legal immigration under the general guise of protecting American workers. But I believe this bill is exactly wrong and exactly counterproductive because the kinds of people who are going to be excluded from this bill are Ph.D.'s, scientists, M.D.'s, and those who have great proficiency and capability for adding much to employment potential in this country.

In 1989-90, I sponsored the lead amendment to add people to come in people who were in demand in industry. I did that because the chamber of commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers were interested in that as a job-producing approach. Again, this year, after having meetings with extensive numbers of my constituents in Pennsylvania, both in Pittsburgh and Philadelphia, I have found that there is a tremendous demand for these highly skilled people, and that the people are not available in the United States to take the jobs. Rather than decreasing employment opportunities for American workers, the bringing in of these additional people will increase the employment opportunities.

I also say, Mr. President, that Americans should never lose sight of the fact that this is a nation of immigrants. It is something that I feel particularly strongly about since both of my parents were immigrants.

My father came to the United States at the age of 18, literally walked across Europe from the Ukraine with barely a ruble in his pocket, rode steerage, the bottom of the boat, to come to America for a better life for himself and his family.

My father was a great contributor to the United States. He did not know when he came over steerage he had a round-trip ticket back to Europe, back to France, not to Paris and the Follies Bergere, but to the Argonne Forest, where he served with great pride in the United States Army. He rose to the rank of buck private. I say that somewhat facetiously because my dad was at the bottom of the totem pole in rank but at the top of the totem pole in dedication, loyalty, bravery.

In the Argonne Forest, he sustained shrapnel in his legs, wounds he carried with him until the day he died. But he was a great American, a great contributor to this country. He was an immigrant. If he had been barred from the United States, I would not be in the U.S. Senate today. In fact, I would not be.

My mother, too, came as an immigrant, as a child of 5 with her parents from a small town on the Russian-Polish border. She, too, was a great American, raising a family. My brother, two sisters and I have had the advantage of an education in America and have been able to share in the American dream, as have so many Americans. More than sharing in the American dream, the immigrants have created the American dream. This is a factor that I think has to be borne in mind.

I talked to my distinguished colleague, Senator SIMPSON, about this bill. Senator SIMPSON made the unusual effort of coming to see me twice. When Senator SIMPSON walked in, he said, "I've been here for lunch frequently with the Wednesday Group, but I never looked at the pictures." I showed Senator SIMPSON a picture of Mordecai Shem, my mother's father, who came in 1905, another great American. I showed him a picture of my father in military uniform marrying my mother in St. Joe in 1919.

I said to Senator SIMPSON, "I'm going to agree with you on just about nothing on this immigration bill." I think the future of our country is wrapped up in inviting these highly skilled, highly trained immigrants to create more jobs and more prosperity in America.

AN OMNIBUS APPROPRIATIONS BILL

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I am optimistic today that the Congress will move forward with an omnibus appropriations bill to cover the departments now not covered in existing legislation. I have been particularly concerned about what has happened to the subcommittee of Appropriations which I have the honor to chair, the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services and Education. The absence of an appropriations bill in these departments has been very, very, very problematic.

It has been impossible for the Secretary of Labor to plan on worker safety and impossible for the Secretary of Education to advise various States as

to the allocation of their funding. It has been impossible for the Secretary of Health and Human Services to make allocations on very important items, although we have taken some items out like the National Institutes of Health, where we have maintained, again, an increased appropriation on that very important line.

I had scheduled last week a hearing of the three Secretaries to outline the needs of their Departments and to the approaches which they might be able to take. I deferred that hearing because, in the absence of knowing how much the additional funding would be, it was impossible to have that hearing in a meaningful way.

I had been in touch with the Chief of Staff, Leon Panetta, on a number of occasions spreading over several weeks trying to push ahead to see to it that we had an opportunity to construct this legislation well in advance of the March 15 date when the current continuing resolution would expire.

As a matter of fact, I even made an effort to talk to Chief of Staff Panetta when he was traveling with the President recently, when he traveled Friday to Wilkes-Barre, where the President was due to stop to look at flood damage in Pennsylvania, which was very extensive. There is flood damage all over the State, not only with the Susquehanna in Wilkes-Barre, the Lackawanna River in Scranton, and the Susquehanna through central Pennsylvania, very great damage off Dauphin and Cumberland counties, other places, Pittsburgh as well, and western Pennsylvania.

When the President came to Wilkes-Barre, he was scheduled to have Mr. Panetta with him. I thought I would be able to get the facts there. But Chief of Staff Panetta had left the party, so I had a chance to talk with the President about the additional funding. The President was in agreement we needed to do just that.

Yesterday I was advised that there would be an additional \$4.5 billion in budget authority, slightly in excess of \$1.7 billion in budget outlays, so we can go ahead.

I am looking forward to rescheduling the hearing with Secretary of Labor Reich, Secretary of Health and Human Services Shalala, Secretary of Education Riley, to make a determination as to where those funds ought to be added.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my letter to Chief of Staff Leon Panetta dated February 20, 1996, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
Washington, DC, February 20, 1996.

Hon. LEON PANETTA,
Chief of Staff, the White House, Washington, DC.

DEAR LEON: I called again this morning to try to find out from you the possible offsets to add approximately \$3.3 billion for appropriations for my Subcommittee on Labor,